

Cruzane Mountain Project

Noxious Weeds Report

Prepared by:
Carly Aniballi
District Silviculturist
&
District Weed Management Coordinator

For:
Superior Ranger District
Lolo National Forest

9/20/2019

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.

Contents

Introduction	4
Forest Plan Direction and Regulatory Framework	4
Analysis Area Boundary	5
Analysis Methodology	6
Resource Indicators and Measures	6
Existing Conditions	6
Existing Weed Control Measures	6
Existing Weed Monitoring Measures	7
Environmental Consequences	7
Resource Protection Measures	7
Effects Common to All Alternatives	8
Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Effects of No Action Alternative	8
Direct and Indirect Effects of Action Alternative	8
Cumulative Effects	10
Relationship to the Forest Plan	12
Supporting Documents and Analysis	12
Literature Cited	12
Appendix A	13

Tables

Table 1. Resource Indicators and Measures	6
Table 2: Resource Protection Measures	7
Table 3: Project Monitoring	8
Table 4: Road Construction and Treatments	10
Table 5: Montana Noxious Weed List (Montana Dept. of Agriculture 2010)	13

Introduction

Noxious weeds are a serious threat on the Lolo National Forest and they are increasing and expanding their range. (USDA Forest Service, 2007). The term “noxious weed” as defined by the Plant Protection Act of 2000 means any plant or plant product that can directly or indirectly injure or cause damage to crops (including nursery stock or plant products), livestock, poultry, or other interests of agriculture, irrigation, navigation, the natural resources of the United States, the public health, or the environment. Noxious weeds have an impact to wildlife habitat quality, soil and water resources, and native plant habitat and diversity. Noxious weeds are usually associated with disturbance factors, but the reality is that some plant communities are at risk to invasion even in the absence of man-created disturbances.

This analysis will focus on how the proposed management activities would affect the susceptibility of native plant communities to the establishment and spread of noxious weeds.

Forest Plan Direction and Regulatory Framework

Forest Plan Direction

The Lolo National Forest Plan Amendment 11 (USDA FS, 1991) directs weed control projects to focus where they would have the greatest effect on preventing the spread of weeds or damage to natural resources, and where they would have the greatest benefit to people who are actively trying to control weeds adjacent to the Lolo National Forest (pg. 1). Amendment 11 further states that priority would be given to weed control projects in areas relatively free of weeds, the roads that lead into those areas, and to new infestations and small patches that threaten areas at high or moderate risk of weed invasion (pp. 1-2).

Laws, Regulations, FSM/FSM

Direction and authority for weed management on National Forest System lands comes from a wide variety of laws, policy and direction. These include but are not limited to the following:

- **National Forest Management Act (PL 94-588, NFMA), the National Environmental Policy Act (PL 91-190, NEPA).** Provides general land management and environmental analysis direction.
- **The Plant Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 7701 et seq) as amended by the Noxious Weed Control and Eradication Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-412).** Among other provisions, the Plant Protection Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prohibit or restrict the importation, entry, exportation, or movement in interstate commerce of any plant, plant product, biological control organism, noxious weed, article, or means of conveyance, if the Secretary determines that the prohibition or restriction is necessary to prevent the introduction into the United States or the dissemination of a plant pest or noxious weed within the United States. The Act defines the term “Noxious Weed”.
- **Executive Order 13112 of 1999,** Directs Federal agencies to: (1) identify actions that may affect status of an invasive species; (2)(a) prevent introduction of such species; (b) detect and control such species; (c) monitor population of such species; (d) provide for restoration of native species; (e) conduct research on invasive species and develop technologies to prevent introduction of such species; (f) promote public education of such species; and (3) not authorize, fund, or carry out actions likely to cause the introduction or spread of invasive species in the United States or elsewhere unless the benefits of the action clearly outweigh the harm and the agencies take steps to minimize the harm.

- **Forest Service Manual 2000 – National Forest Resource Management – Zero Code 2900 – Invasive Species Management**, identifies Forest Supervisor and District Ranger responsibilities for preventing weed establishment and spread of existing weed populations.
- **36 CFR Subpart A, Section 222.8** directs the Forest to cooperate with local weed control districts to develop control programs where there are National Forests and Grasslands.
- In Montana, the **Montana County Noxious Weed Management Act** (MCA 7-22-2101) states that it's unlawful for any person to allow weeds to propagate or go to seed on their land unless they have an approved weed management plan. This act directs the counties to develop weed control districts to plan and implement weed control efforts.

In addition to the above, weed management direction and support is provided in the following:

- **The 1998 Northern Region Overview** addressed priority needs for ecosystem health and recreation, saying, “Noxious weeds are one of the most serious threats to ecological integrity.” It identified integrated weed control as a priority action.
- **The 1998 Forest Service Strategy for Noxious and Nonnative Invasive Plant Management** provided a “roadmap into the future for preventing and controlling the spread of noxious weeds and non-native invasive plants.
- **Forest Service Manual 2259.03** states “Forest offices shall cooperate fully with State, County and Federal officials in implementing 36 CFR 222.8 and sections one and two of Public Law 90-583. Within budgetary constraints, the Forest Service shall control to the extent practical, noxious farm weeds on all National Forest System lands.”
- **The 2004 National Strategy and Implementation Plan for Invasive Species Management** identifies the Forest Service as one of the lead agencies in the fight against invasive plants. It provides long-term direction to reduce, minimize or eliminate invasive species across all landscapes and ownerships by improving the management of invasive species science-based technology, by emphasizing partnerships, and by increasing performance and accountability, as well as communication and education.

Analysis Area Boundary

Spatial Boundary

Activities which create canopy openings, reduce cover of competing vegetation or create favorable soil conditions such as newly exposed soil surfaces and increased nutrient availability are known to make sites susceptible to new or increased existing weed populations (Erickson et al., 2007). Only those activities currently proposed in the Cruzane Mountain project will be evaluated in this analysis. The analysis area boundary for the weeds report will be the implementation sites for the proposed on-the-ground activities such as vegetation management, road maintenance and associated activities such as timber hauling. All proposed activities that have on-the-ground disturbance would be evaluated regardless of their distance to known infestations because weed seed is transported by a multitude of carriers and an ample seed bank exists relative to sites proposed for activity.

Temporal Boundary

The time span for looking at effects of the action alternatives is over the 10 years following the start of proposed activities. This time frame was chosen because of the risk of noxious weed establishment and spread can occur immediately after the activities begin, or 5 to 10 years (average seed viability) after activities cease.

It is assumed that after 10 years the susceptibility risk of establishment and spread due to the proposed activities would return to same level of risk as today. This assumption is based on the disturbance and canopy cover recovering to a sufficient amount to reduce the susceptibility risk to the level it was before the proposed activities. It is also assumed that this recovery rate is an average; some areas would recover in less than five years, while other areas would take more than ten years.

Analysis Methodology

The methods, information sources, science, assumptions and limitations that are used for the analysis in this report are noted in individual sections of the report.

Resource Indicators and Measures

Measurement indicators are used to assess a project's probability of contributing to the establishment, spread and persistence of noxious weeds.

Table 1. Resource Indicators and Measures

Resource Element	Resource Indicator and Measure
Effects of harvest on the risk of weed establishment and spread	Number of acres of soil and canopy disturbance due to harvest
Effects of road work on the risk of weed establishment and spread	Number of acres of road work at high risk of weed establishment and spread

Existing Conditions

Existing Weed Populations

An ocular survey for the presence of weed species on a representative sample of roads and proposed treatment areas in the project area was done by the district weed coordinator in the field season of 2018 and 2019. Some information was gathered from weed inventories of the roads that were sprayed in 2010 and 2015 in the Forest Service Natural Resource Information System database. This analysis will assume that the roads within the project area have, to some degree, a weed population along them.

Using the gathered weed information, it was determined that St. Johnswort (*Hypericum perforatum*), is the most widespread weed within the project area. This noxious weed species is found on the roads and on the open, drier south aspects within the analysis area. Oxeye daisy (*Chrysanthemum leucanthemum*), meadow hawkweed complex, (*Hieracium pretense*, *H. floribundum*, *H. piloselloides*), and spotted knapweed (*Centaurea stoebe*) are present within the analysis area and are found mostly in the road corridors with some incursions under the forest canopy.

Existing Weed Control Measures

Since 1996, there has been over 56,000 acres of noxious weeds treated forest wide. Within the same timeframe, the Superior Ranger District treated over 9,800 acres across the district. Within the last 10 years, there has been some noxious weed management within the analysis area. Under past NEPA decisions, Roads #288, and #3845 were treated with herbicide for a total of about 39 acres. Field observations in September 2019 noted the presence of a biological control agent for St. Johnswort, *Chrysolina spp.* in areas of heavy St. Johnswort infestations along the south face of Cruzane Mountain, above Interstate I-90.

Existing Weed Monitoring Measures

Forest Service policy requires that at least half of the total acres treated within a given year be monitored for efficacy. This efficacy monitoring of the required acreage could be areas recently treated or treated in past years. Since 2006, the forest has monitored over 36,000 acres for treatment efficacy. Herbicide efficacy has been very good (90+ percent) across the forest for the first couple of years after treatment. If the first herbicide treatment is not followed up with other subsequent treatments, the herbicide efficacy starts to diminish over time.

Environmental Consequences

Introduction

The primary reason for noxious weed spread is soil disturbance that creates a suitable seed bed that allows weed seeds to germinate and survive. Any activity that creates exposed soil has the potential to accelerate the spread of noxious weeds. Activities such as building roads and firelines, skidding timber, and natural events such as wildfire creates soil disturbance that has the potential to introduce and accelerate the spread of weeds.

Factors limiting the spread of weeds on moderate and high-risk sites are: shade from tree canopies, higher soil moisture, needle and grass litter that provides a mulch-like covering of the ground, lack of exposed soil and native plant competition. Any activity that decreases any of these has the potential to introduce, establish, accelerate the spread and increase the persistence of noxious weeds.

Resource Protection Measures

Table 2 lists the resource protection measures to be used during the implementation of the proposed activities. While these measures would not absolutely prevent the spread of weeds in the project area, they would reduce the risk of establishment and spread of the weeds associated with the proposed activities.

Table 2: Resource Protection Measures

Roadwork - All roads	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clean off-road equipment (power or high pressure cleaning) of all mud, dirt, and plant parts before moving into the area. (<i>Standard Operating Procedures</i>) 2. Roads would be treated prior to any road activity including but not limited to road construction, reconstruction, maintenance, and haul unless existing road conditions (i.e., vegetation on road, road barriers, etc.) prohibit reasonable access for spraying equipment. Reasonable access would be determined by the District Weed Coordinator. If existing road conditions prohibit access, then treatment would be deferred until the road activities clear the obstruction. (<i>FS personnel</i>) 3. If gravel or other material is hauled for road surfacing, it would be from a site (pit) that has been previously treated for weeds and is currently weed free, where possible. (<i>Standard Operating Procedures</i>) 4. Seed disturbed sites with native seed mixtures or appropriate Lolo seed mixtures. (<i>Standard Operating Procedures</i>) 5. Straw used for road stabilization and erosion control would be certified weed-free or weed seed-free. (<i>Standard Operating Procedures</i>)
Harvest Treatments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Clean off-road equipment (power or high pressure cleaning) of all mud, dirt, and plant parts before moving into the area. (<i>Standard Operating Procedures</i>) 7. Where possible, before and during sale prep., locate and spray, if needed, possible

	<p>landing sites. Note to sale administrator, where possible, approve skid trails, skyline corridors and landing locations where there are no obvious standing weed infestations. <i>(FS personnel)</i></p> <p>8. Temporary roads would be treated with herbicide prior to final road obliteration unless waived by agreement. <i>(Standard Operating Procedures)</i></p> <p>9. Regeneration units on the south face of Cruzane Mountain where St. John's wort populations are highest would be planted with native trees to expedite the establishment of tree canopy cover in these units. <i>(FS and/or contract personnel)</i></p>
Reforestation	<p>10. At the discretion of the Contracting Officer, all equipment, vehicles, and trailers of the planting contractor shall be free of all dirt, plant parts, and material that may carry noxious weeds. <i>(Standard Operating Procedures)</i></p>

In addition to the resource protection measures, Table 3 lists the monitoring that would be used to detect and eradicate new infestations or reduce the weed populations.

Table 3: Project Monitoring

<p>1. Monitor for the presence of new weed infestations within the harvest treatment areas in conjunction with other future monitoring and/or inventory activities. <i>(FS personnel)</i></p> <p>2. Roads treated would be monitored for herbicide efficiency, the presence of a new noxious weed or the spread of an existing noxious weed in conjunction with other subsequent activities in the area. <i>(FS personnel)</i></p>
--

Effects Common to All Alternatives

Ongoing weed treatments (conducted as part of the Superior Ranger District's annual program) along the drivable roads within the project area would continue and are authorized under the 2007 Lolo NF Integrated Weed Management Record of Decision.

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Effects of No Action Alternative

No ground disturbing activities are proposed in the No Action Alternative. The population and the weeds species currently present can be expected to increase within the project area. The majority of weed spread has been and would likely continue to occur along roadsides and trails (both wildlife and manmade) where seeds are introduced by human and wildlife activity. The weeds along these vectors would likely move into adjacent areas if the conditions in those areas are conducive to establishment.

Direct and Indirect Effects of Action Alternative

All references to acreages within this section are approximate.

Effect of Mechanical Vegetation Harvest:

All of the proposed harvest areas are assumed to have, to varying degrees, established weed populations adjacent to their boundaries, mainly along existing roads (see existing conditions section). Of these established weed populations, the predominant weed species is St. Johnswort. Some spotted knapweed with a minor component of meadow hawkweed complex and oxeye daisy are also along some of the

roads. All three species prefer growing in full sunlight in dry gravelly or sandy soils, although hawkweed would tolerate shade better than knapweed and St. Johnswort.

Harvest treatments reduce canopy cover by varying degrees, depending on treatment type. The reduced canopy cover would increase the amount of available light penetrating to the forest floor. The existing forest floor vegetation would respond positively to this increased light. If weeds are part of this existing vegetation, the weeds too would respond positively to the increased level of light.

The tree canopy cover left after the treatment would eventually increase and fill in the gaps created by the tree removal as the trees respond in growth to the increase in light, moisture and nutrients from the removal of competing trees. This response would eventually limit the amount of available light reaching the forest floor, thereby slowing the growth of the forest floor vegetation. The more canopy cover that is initially removed, the greater length of time it would take the trees to fill in the gaps and limit the amount of light. Reforestation of regeneration harvest treatments would accelerate the re-establishment of canopy cover, decreasing the susceptibility to weed establishment.

Thinning and Fuelbreak treatments:

There are 430 acres (17 percent of overall acreage in proposed action) of thinning treatments, which includes commercial thinning and improvement cuts. There are also about 15 acres (less than 1 percent of overall acreage in proposed action) of fuelbreak treatments.

Thinning treatments would reduce the amount of the canopy cover by approximately 40 to 60 percent within treated areas. If weeds are present and adjacent to these disturbed areas, the risk of weeds establishing and spreading is **low to moderate**.

Regeneration Treatments:

There are 981 acres (38 percent of overall acreage in proposed action) of regeneration treatments.

Regeneration treatments would reduce the amount of canopy cover by approximately 80-100 percent within treated areas.

If weeds are present and adjacent to these disturbed areas, the risk of weeds establishing and spreading is **moderate to high**.

Road work:

A study by Birdsall and others (2012) suggest that roads contribute more to the spread of weeds than silvicultural treatments. Any road activity such as temporary road construction, or existing road reconstruction, maintenance, has the potential to contribute to the establishment and spread of weeds.

Temporary road construction has the potential to contribute to weed spread by removing the vegetation and by moving large amounts of dirt and disturbing the ground to excavate a road. When the harvest is completed, the road is then obliterated and re-shaped to original contour, thus disturbing the soil again. These actions to build and obliterate temporary roads create the soil disturbance conditions needed for germination of seed, whether native or non-native. If weeds are present, the risk of weeds establishing and spreading is **high**.

Road reconstruction such as brush removal, and road maintenance such as blading, ditch cleaning and installing drainage dips have the potential to contribute to weeds spread by removing vegetation from the road surface and disturbing the road surface, creating a bed for germination of seed, whether native or non-native. If weeds are present while this work is preformed, the risk of weeds re-establishing and spreading is **high**.

Table 4 below displays the road treatments and the amount in acres and miles by each alternative.

Table 4: Road Construction and Treatments

Road Treatments	Proposed Action Acres* (miles)
Road Construction	
Temporary roads	21.6 (4.4)
New construction	19.6 (4)
Road Maintenance	68.6 (14)
Total	109.8 (22.4)

*4.9 acres per mile was used – 40ft average width of road multiplied by 5,280'/mile divided by 43,560 sq. ft. per acre

The roads that bisect or are adjacent to proposed activities within this project area are of particular concern. These roads are the primary sources of weed seed that could invade and establish within the proposed activity areas. The existing weeds along the roads could also be transported into uninfested areas on the machinery or vehicles that would be used to accomplish the proposed activities (Birdsall et al., 2012).

Past weed treatments along the drivable roads are reducing the weed populations, thereby reducing the potential of weed seed dispersal and weed establishment.

Along with the ongoing weed treatments, resource protection measures #1-5 would reduce the likelihood of weeds spreading and becoming a prominent vegetative component within the road corridors.

Cumulative Effects

Past Actions and their effects on current conditions

Past soil disturbing activities, over the last sixty years, whether they are as a result of logging, road construction, wildfire, wildlife, prescribed fire, insect and disease mortality, windthrow or recreational use have helped spread noxious weeds into and throughout the analysis area.

Timber harvest has occurred on approximately 1,234 acres of National Forest within the analysis area since the 1960's. Prior to the 1980s timber harvest methods were primarily ground-based systems which often resulted in large amounts of soil disturbance.

There are approximately 24 miles of system roads under USFS jurisdiction, primarily concentrated in specific areas.

It is not known when the first noxious weeds established in the project area. A good estimate would be in the late 1800's when sheep grazing introduced St. Johnswort to the area. Although there are no records, it is assumed that road construction and timber harvest have contributed to the weed spread throughout analysis area as a result of timber harvest in the early half of the 1900's.

Since 1996, there has been over 56,000 acres of noxious weeds treated forest wide. Within the same timeframe, the Superior Ranger District treated over 9,800 acres across the district.

Within the last 10 years, there has been some noxious weed management within the analysis area. Under past NEPA decisions, roads #288, and #3845 were treated with herbicide for a total of about 39 acres

Contrasting Effects of Proposed Actions with Past Actions

Before the early-1990s, there were few, if any noxious weed prevention measures in place. The Lolo National Forest adopted preventive measures to avoid weed spread and introduction of new invasive species with the 1991 Noxious Weed Management Amendment to the Lolo Forest Plan. This authorized integrated pest management strategies including the use of certain herbicides. Contractual provisions included washing of equipment to remove weed seeds and propagules prior to entry onto National Forest System land, contactor herbicide spraying of haul routes and use of weed-free seed grass to re-vegetate disturbed ground. These weed control measures have been included with timber harvest, road building and fire suppression activities to reduce the risk of invasive species. In 2007, the Lolo National Forest adopted an adaptive and integrated weed management strategy to include treatment of new weed species, new weed patches and use of new control methods with the Integrated Weed Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This EIS also allows weed treatment of up to 15,000 acres / year on the forest.

Effects of Ongoing and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions

The weed populations would continue to be influenced by a variety of land-uses including recreation, forest management, private land development, road construction, use, and maintenance, and the results of weed management. This is true across all land ownerships.

Under the 2007 Lolo NF Integrated Weed Management EIS and Record of Decision (ROD), roadside herbicide treatments began in the spring field season of 2010 on roads #288 and #3845 within the project area. These treatments have reduced the populations of weeds within the project area.

Combined Effects of Past, Proposed, and Ongoing Management Direction

The ground disturbing harvest activities associated with the proposed action could potentially promote the establishment of new weed species and increase the spread of weeds. However, resource protection measures #1-10 would reduce the likelihood of weeds spreading and becoming a prominent vegetative component within the project area.

Roadwork associated with the alternatives would be a greater concern of promoting the establishment and spread of weeds than the improvement and salvage cuts (Birdsall et al., 2012). The past spraying treatments and future spraying would continue to reduce these populations along the drivable roads. Also, the resource protection measures #1-5 would help minimize the risk of weed spread on haul roads during implementation. Weeds on the undrivable roads would continue to spread until the road prism is sufficiently shaded from the surrounding forest and from the vegetation growing in the road prism to slow the spread.

Private and state land located in and along the edges of the project area would be a source for weed seed. Weed treatments on this private land may or may not occur depending on the landowner. This also could increase the amount of existing weeds and the possibly the number of species gradually over time in the project area.

The Superior Ranger District has an active weed management program. Approximately 200 to 1,000 acres are treated each year across the district. Also, biological control agents are being placed in multiple locations across the district.

In the future, this area would be a popular destination for hunters, wood cutters, huckleberry pickers, and other visitors. Summer and fall are the primary months of visitor activity. Recreationists would likely spread the existing weeds or introduce a new invasive species into the analysis area. The vehicle traffic on the open road system within this analysis area could be a conduit for the introduction of a new species or the spread of the existing weeds.

Relationship to the Forest Plan

This is a site-specific analysis. The proposed action would comply with the 1986 Lolo National Forest Plan and Lolo NF Plan Amendment 11, which addresses weed management, as well as other previously listed laws, regulations, and policies. This analysis focuses on specific issues pertaining to the project areas; it is not a general management plan for the project area. It provides site-specific direction for implementing the Lolo NF Forest Plan in compliance with NEPA requirements.

Supporting Documents and Analysis

The potential impacts of proposed weed control activities are analyzed in this EA. This EA would incorporate by reference the guidelines, findings, and analysis described in the following documents:

- Lolo Forest Plan (USDA-FS 1986)
- Lolo NF Plan Amendment 11, the FEIS and ROD for Noxious Weed Management on the Lolo NF (USDA-FS 1991)
- FEIS and ROD for Integrated Weed Management on the Lolo National Forest (USDA-FS-2007)

Literature Cited

Birdsall, Jennifer L., McCaughey, Ward W., Runyon, Justin B. 2012 Roads impact the distribution of noxious weeds more than restoration treatments in a lodgepole pine forest in Montana, U.S.A. Restoration Ecology Vol 20, No 4, pp 517-523

Erickson, Heather E. & Rachel White. 2007. Invasive Plant Species and the Joint Fire Science Program. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-707. 18p.

USDA Forest Service. 1991. Lolo National Forest Plan Amendment No.11 (Noxious Weed Management). Daniels, Orville. 1991. Record of Decision – Noxious Weed Management Amendment to the Lolo National Forest Plan. Lolo National Forest.

USDA Forest Service. 2007. Integrated Weed Management on the Lolo National Forest Final Environmental Impact Statement. Lolo National Forest.

Appendix A

Table 5: Montana Noxious Weed List (Montana Dept. of Agriculture 2010)

Common Name	Scientific Name	Known Weeds in Project Area	Potential Invader to Project Area
Priority 1A – These weeds not present (or little presence) in Montana. Management criteria will require eradication if detected: education: and prevention.			
Yellow starthistle	<i>Centaurea solstitialis</i> ^a		X
Priority 1B - These weeds have limited presence in Montana. Management criteria will require eradication or containment and education.			
Dyer's Woad	<i>Isatis tinctoria</i>		X
Flowering Rush	<i>Butomus umbellatus</i>		
Japanese knotweed complex	<i>Polygonum spp.</i>		X
Purple Loosestrife	<i>Lythrum spp.</i>		X
Rush skeletonweed	<i>Chondrilla juncea</i>		X
Eurasian watermilfoil	<i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i>		N/A
Scotch broom	<i>Cytisus scoparius</i>		X
Curlyleaf pondweed	<i>Potamogeton crispus</i>		N/A
Priority 2A - These weeds are common in isolated areas of Montana. Management criteria will require eradication or containment where less abundant. Management shall be prioritized by local weed districts.			
Tansy ragwort	<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>		X
Meadow hawkweed complex	<i>Hieracium spp.</i>	X	
Orange hawkweed	<i>Hieracium aurantiacum</i>	X	
Tall buttercup	<i>Ranunculus acris</i>		X
Perennial pepperweed	<i>Lepidium latifolium</i>		X
Yellowflag iris	<i>Iris pseudacorus</i>		N/A
Blueweed	<i>Echium vulgare</i>		X
Hoary alyssum	<i>Berteroa incana</i>		X
Priority 2B – These weeds are abundant in Montana and widespread in many counties. Management criteria will require eradication or containment where less abundant. Management shall be prioritized by local weed districts.			
Canada thistle	<i>Cirsium arvense</i>		X
Field bindweed	<i>Convolvulus arvensis</i>		X
Leafy spurge	<i>Euphorbia esula</i>		X
Whitetop	<i>Cardaria draba</i>		X
Russian knapweed	<i>Centaurea repens</i>		X
Spotted knapweed	<i>Centaurea stoebe or maculosa</i>	X	
Diffuse knapweed	<i>Centaurea diffusa</i>		X
Dalmatian toadflax	<i>Linaria dalmatica</i>		X
St. Johnswort	<i>Hypericum perforatum</i>	X	
Sulfur cinquefoil	<i>Potentilla recta</i>		X
Common tansy	<i>Tanacetum vulgare</i>		X
Oxeye daisy	<i>Chrysanthemum leucanthemum</i>	X	
Houndstongue	<i>Cynoglossum officinale</i>		X
Yellow toadflax	<i>Linaria vulgaris</i>		X
Saltcedar	<i>Tamarix spp.</i>		N/A
Priority 3 - Regulated plants: (NOT MONTANA LISTED NOXIOUS WEEDS). These regulated plants have the potential to have significant negative impacts. The plant may not be intentionally spread or sold other than as a contaminant in agricultural products. The state recommends research, education and prevention to minimize the spread of the regulated plant.			
Cheatgrass	<i>Bromus tectorum</i>		X
Hydrilla	<i>Hydrilla verticillata</i>		N/A
Russian olive	<i>Elaeagnus angustifolia</i>		X
^a Nomenclature follows the Montana Noxious Weed List			